# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

HONORABLE NANCY G. EDMUNDS

V.

Case No. 14-CR-20614

JASON FLOAREA,

Defendant.

SENTENCING HEARING

Thursday, April 16, 2015

#### Appearances:

Kenneth R. Chadwell Gjon Juncaj U.S. Attorney's Office 211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001 Detroit, MI 48226 313-226-9100 Email: ken.chadwell@usdoj.gov On behalf of Plaintiff

James C. Thomas O'Reilly Rancilio P.C. 12900 Hall Road, Suite 350 Sterling Heights, MI 48313 586-726-1000 Email: jthomas@orlaw.com On behalf of Defendant

ALSO PRESENT: Jim Baldinger, Counsel for Sprint Corporation

Suzanne Jacques, Official Court Reporter www.transcriptorders.com • email: jacques@transcriptorders.com

D E X

1

2

3

4

5	Proceeding	Page
6	Sentencing Hearing	
7	Comments by Mr. Clint Breithaupt	5
8	Allocution by Mr. Thomas	7
9	Allocution by Mr. Chadwell	9
10	Comments by Mr. Juncaj	10
11	Allocution by the Defendant	11
12		
13	Sentence of the Court	13
14		
15	Certification of Court Reporter	19
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	Case No. 14-CR-20614 U.S.A. vs.	Floarea

MR. THOMAS: I ask you to, yes.

THE COURT: I will do that.

22

23

2.4

25

Mr. Thomas, have you had an opportunity to review the Presence Investigation Report with Mr. Floarea?

MR. THOMAS: I have, Judge. It's complete and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

accurate in all respects. We reviewed the sentencing quidelines calculation, and we understand the sentencing quideline range is going to be 12 to 18 months with a category I, 12 to 18 months guideline range. THE COURT: Right. Any objections for the government, Mr. Chadwell? MR. CHADWELL: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: I should just point out that with the agreement that was reached with Sprint recently, technically, I should raise the guideline range because the loss amount is greater, but I'm not going to do that for purposes of sentencing. It was our understanding by entering MR. THOMAS: into the agreement that we would not increase the guideline range by doing that, and I appreciate that, Judge. MR. CHADWELL: And from the government's point of view, the guideline range is sufficient to address... THE COURT: I appreciate that. I understand. I understand, Mr. Baldinger, you wish to make a statement? MR. BALDINGER: Actually, Your Honor, my client is here and would like to address the Court.

THE COURT: That would be fine. Brief statement?

MR. BALDINGER: Your Honor, this is Mr. Clint

Breithaupt. He is a senior investigator, fraud manager from

Case No. 14-CR-20614 U.S.A. vs. Floarea

Sprint, who wanted to address the Court regarding the defendant's conduct and the impact it has had.

Do you want him to be sworn?

2.2

2.4

THE COURT: No, he doesn't need to be sworn. Go ahead.

MR. BREITHAUPT: Your Honor, my name is Clint
Breithaupt and I represent Sprint Corporation and its
subsidiaries in federal civil lawsuits against handset
traffickers. I'm here today to explain the significant harm
that Mr. Floarea's conduct caused to Sprint.

I've worked for Sprint for almost 16 years. Prior to that, I was a law enforcement officer for five years, and for 21 years I have investigated multiple types of criminal activities. During that time, I've never seen a criminal enterprise as large as the one that Jason Floarea operated under Ace Wholesale Incorporated. In fact, all of the other handset traffickers in this area that Sprint has sued all say that they learned the business from Jason Floarea, and that, in fact, he's the godfather of handset trafficking.

The magnitude of wireless handsets trafficked, and subsequent losses, in this case is staggering. I'm not aware of any other prosecution of a handset trafficker who has dealt in such large quantities of phones.

From October 2010 until the company was shut down by law enforcement in August of 2012, Mr. Floarea's company

2.4

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

trafficked in 371,702 wireless handsets, which he then sold, primarily overseas to China, for \$151 million. Of those, 67,753 were Sprint handsets which Ace Wholesale sold for over \$24 million. Sprint losses exceed over \$85 million in this case. Myself as well as other members of Sprint's fraud department analyzed the data and identified that at least 42,382 of these Sprint handsets were obtained by fraudulent means.

Handset trafficking has cost Sprint hundreds of millions of dollars. These traffickers take advantage of programs that Sprint offers to make its phones more affordable to its customers. Not only does this harm Sprint, but it harms our consumers.

Mr. Floarea's crimes against Sprint helped fuel a wave of violent crime throughout the communities that he operated in. In fact, in a report by the U.S. Department of Justice Bureau Assistance stated significant increase of the theft of wireless phones, and lists Detroit as having the sixth highest rate of smartphone thefts per capita in the nation.

Sprint implemented a program to take aggressive action against handset traffickers like Ace Wholesale and Jason Floarea. To date, Sprint has filed 57 lawsuits against 198 handset trafficker defendants in federal courts across the country.

Too often with this type of criminal activity, there is so much money involved that being incarcerated is just the cost of doing business. Sprint asks the Court to send a message today to Mr. Floarea and anyone else thinking of conducting this type of criminal activity that you can't afford to do business in the State of Michigan.

Sprint urges the Court to consider a prison term of 18 months for Mr. Floarea.

Thank you.

2.2

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. BALDINGER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Sure.

Mr. Thomas, is there anything you'd like to say on behalf of Mr. Floarea before I impose sentence?

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, should we address you from here, or shall we approach?

THE COURT: Be easier if you would address me from the podium, easier for Suzanne I think, too.

MR. THOMAS: I did not expect to hear from Sprint on this, especially since we had settled the case. And despite the hyperbole of what it was that was just said to you, we stand here and have been ready to resolve our issue, to pay our debts, to withstand the significant forfeitures that have occurred in this case, and to be ready for the sentencing that you're going to impose.

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

You have the ability to depart downward, you know that. I don't have to argue about the case law that goes for that. I presented to you a sentencing memorandum which shows the other side of Mr. Floarea; the fact that he's a family man, that he has four small children at home, that he has a devoted wife, how much he's given up as a result of being involved in what was alleged by the government and what we ultimately did resolve by one count of plea by information.

We have resolved with Sprint in spite of the hyperbole of that conversation that you just heard, that case, by agreeing to the \$600,000 that has been stipulated to in part of the restitution agreement.

I ask that the Court take into consideration all the purposes of sentencing, not send a message, but to take a look at Mr. Floarea individually and sentence him accordingly.

I've had the chance to be with him since the beginning of this investigation. He has been diligent, he's been straightforward, he's come to me and has attempted to try and resolve it over these years. Mr. Chadwell has been more than patient with us in working out what we think is a reasonable solution to this case.

So I'm going to leave it to your discretion. Of course, he does not want to go to prison. His wife is here, she doesn't want him to go to prison. You have the ability to give him a sentence anywhere between probation and the

2.2

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

guidelines, to the top of the guidelines, and so I'm asking you to use your discretion.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Thomas.

THE DEFENDANT: Can I say something?

THE COURT: You will in just a second. I'm going to ask the government first, and then I'm going to come back and give you the last word, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Chadwell.

MR. CHADWELL: We'll just remain here, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's okay.

MR. CHADWELL: Your Honor, from the government's point of view, we do think prison is warranted in this case for really two reasons. One is, if someone engages in a fraud scheme and makes a couple million dollars and only has to pay part of it back and that's it, that's a pretty good deal, and that would encourage other people to continue to do that sort of thing. Your Honor does need to send a message out to society for the general deterrence to discourage other people from doing this.

And the second reason we think jail is warranted is that Mr. Floarea's conduct does encourage other people to commit more serious criminal activity. There are a lot of cell phone store armed robberies in this area, and Mr. Floarea himself would never do that himself, but because he engaged in

## Case 2:14-cr-20614-NGE-MKM ECF No. 23, PageID.805 Filed 05/22/15 Page 10 of 19 10

2.4

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

this business it does encourage people to either do that or to engage in the fraudulent activities that Your Honor has also heard about in various memoranda in this case. And so we do think that other criminal activity occurred because of Mr. Floarea's conduct. We can't say specifically which crimes, but he was engaging in it enough that that did encourage people to commit other more serious crimes. And so for both of those reasons, we believe Your Honor should impose imprisonment in this case.

Mr. Juncaj has a couple comments on the financial matters that are still outstanding.

MR. JUNCAJ: Thank you, Your Honor. Very briefly, the Court recently entered a stipulated order of forfeiture in the amount of \$120,000 money judgment which is payable within 60 days. Separate and apart from forfeiture in this case, the government has initiated a civil forfeiture procedure also, which Mr. Floarea has agreed not to challenge the forfeiture of all the assets in that case, which is about \$900,000 and thousands of electronic devices.

THE COURT: Do you have a copy of the forfeiture agreement? The file was put together before we --

MR. JUNCAJ: I think so, Your Honor. It's a stipulated preliminary order of forfeiture.

THE COURT: I've got it, I'm sorry.

MR. JUNCAJ: Okay. And just so it's noted on the

## Case 2:14-cr-20614-NGE-MKM ECF No. 23, PageID.806 Filed 05/22/15 Page 11 of 19 11

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

record today, there is the restitution that was ordered by the Court and agreed upon, the \$600,000.

THE COURT: I have that, too. Restitution of \$600,000.

MR. JUNCAJ: And then we ask that all that be included in the judgment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. JUNCAJ: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Floarea, I'm happy to hear anything you want to say on your own behalf before I impose sentence.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I hear this stuff going on today, and I'm in shock. When I look at the amounts that they're claiming with losses, in regards to losses, I'm not talking about facts in general, I'm just talking about the magnitude.

Overall, when I started the business, when I went through it, I did it with a clean conscience, not doing it originally thinking this is something wrong or I'm doing it to defraud someone intentionally. As the case progressed, after I got shut down, thus far two and-a-half years, two years and ten months ago roughly, I started hearing about these facts, started hearing about the law, started understanding, okay, so subsidized phones that go out, they're fraud, okay. So I'm guilty of that if that's the law. I take responsibility. If that's the law, we buy something that was once obtained

through subsidized means, I'll obtain that guilt because that's when I found out that that was illegal. Had I known this ahead of time, I would have never been engaged in that.

Simply, how we bought it is how we sold it. We were middle men, and I did not make these kind of -- you heard numbers of millions right now, \$80 million losses. Judge, we worked on a flat rate of 5 to 6 percent profit, period. These are not profit. I'm broke, I have no money. It's been two and-a-half years. Everything I have has been forfeited. You know what I'm saying, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I do.

THE DEFENDANT: So two and-a-half years now has not been easy for me, for our family. It's been stress, it's been a strain on us completely in every -- I mean, other people have lost their minds in this. This is only mercy of God that got me through this so far.

Whatever is left is already gone. All I have left is my family, honest. I'm only left in debt over my head from this. I still have a lot to pay back from here. All this is forfeited. I have nothing to live on from now on. This is it. The house, the house is gone, all this is going to be zero. I still got to work in the future decades to pay back investors that came out because all that money that was seized, that was not my personal money, that was investors' money, working capital. But I'm still responsible on that

## Case 2:14-cr-20614-NGE-MKM ECF No. 23, PageID.808 Filed 05/22/15 Page 13 of 19 13

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

because I gave my word.

MR. THOMAS: Now, I've told you three times --

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, Your Honor, it's a lot of pressure, a lot of stuff for all this time.

THE COURT: I'm sure it is.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Floarea.

Well, this is a sad and difficult case. The guideline provisions are agreed at 12 to 18 months, and that was the agreement in the Rule 11 agreement, as well, which I did accept. Guidelines are advisory, they're not mandatory. The Court is directed to look at the factors under 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a), to impose a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the statutory objectives.

The first factor the Court is directed to consider is the nature and circumstance of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant. We do see two different Jason Floareas here. We see a devoted family man who I think basically is a good person and has a lot to offer to the community, to his neighbors, his family, no question about that. On the other hand, this was a widespread enterprise that, as the government pointed out, does encourage other criminal activity.

The losses to Sprint were considerable, and to Verizon as well, I believe. I mean, I have no reason to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

disbelieve Mr. Floarea when he says he didn't realize at the outset that what he was doing was criminal, but he knew it at some point, and it was a very large and widespread enterprise. So that's one factor.

The second factor is the seriousness of the offense and to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for the offense. I mean, it's a serious economic offense. It's not a violent offense, but again, as the government suggests, it has the tendency to promote violence from others. But this kind of widespread activity and the amount of money that can be made doing it does have a tendency to promote violence.

We do need to provide some punishment. That's what the guidelines intend to do, they try to do. I really look at this factor as a guidelines factor. The guidelines try to take all of these factors into consideration when reaching the 12 to 18 months that's suggested.

The deterrence to criminal conduct and the need to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, I would say it's unlikely that this defendant is going to commit anymore crimes given how devastating this has been for him and for his family, but it is important to establish social deterrence in this case. Others need to see that this kind of activity will not go unpunished and that the bottom line is not worth it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

The other factors aren't really at issue here. There's no need for educational or vocational training, medical care, et cetera. So having said all of that, I think that a short custodial sentence is warranted here, and I know that's going to be hard not just for Mr. Floarea but for his family, for his wife who has been very devoted and supportive through all of this, for his children who want their dad back. I don't think a long custodial sentence is required, but I do believe that a sentence at the bottom of the quideline range is in fact appropriate in this case.

So on Count 1 of the Information, pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the Court, having considered the guideline factors contained in 18 U.S.C. 3553(a), hereby places defendant Jason Floarea into the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 12 months and one day. The reason it's 12 months and one day is that that gives you the time off at the end of the first year, so essentially is a sentence of ten and-a-half months.

A two-year term of supervised release is imposed to follow the term of imprisonment. A special assessment of \$100 is ordered due immediately. The Court finds that given the restitution obligation and the substantial forfeitures, the defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine and therefore does not order one. The Court also waives the costs of incarceration and supervision.

## Case 2:14-cr-20614-NGE-MKM ECF No. 23, PageID.811 Filed 05/22/15 Page 16 of 19 16

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

I don't think mandatory, the mandatory drug testing requirement is necessary. Do you agree, Mr. Chadwell?

MR. CHADWELL: That's correct, Your Honor.

MR. THOMAS: I do, too.

2.2

THE COURT: So I'm going to waive the mandatory drug testing. While on supervised release, defendant shall abide by the standard conditions adopted by this Court as well as the following special condition. Defendant shall make monthly installment payments on any outstanding restitution and forfeiture obligations at a rate recommended by the probation department and approved by the Court. The defendant shall not incur any new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer. Defendant shall provide the probation officer access to any requested financial information.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, is there any way I can be at home, at least kind of home, house arrest or something, with my kids? It's going to be crazy with four kids and my wife alone.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Floarea, I believe that the sentence I've stated is the appropriate sentence in this case.

There's a little bit more. Due to the history of mental health issues, the following special condition is also imposed. If necessary, defendant shall participate in mental

## Case 2:14-cr-20614-NGE-MKM ECF No. 23, PageID.812 Filed 05/22/15 Page 17 of 19 17

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

health counseling at the direction of the probation department, and because of past substance abuse, if necessary, defendant shall participate in a program approved by the probation department for substance abuse which may include testing to determine if the defendant has reverted to the use of drugs or alcohol.

Defendant shall take all medications prescribed by any treating physician and shall not discontinue medication without explicit agreement by such physician.

Mr. Floarea, you do have the right -- oh, we've got the forfeiture that we're entering. The preliminary order of forfeiture will be made part of the judgment and commitment, as well as the restitution obligation to Sprint in the amount of \$600,000.

**PROBATION OFFICER:** Your Honor, mandatory drug testing would apply in this case. The defendant does have a history of marijuana and Vicodin use.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to order that.

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, if the Court is going to order that, then would you put in the judgment that RDAP is suggested?

THE COURT: He won't qualify for RDAP.

MR. THOMAS: Well, then, why mandatory testing for drugs?

THE COURT: It's part of the supervised release.

## Case 2:14-cr-20614-NGE-MKM ECF No. 23, PageID.813 Filed 05/22/15 Page 18 of 19 18

Sentencing Hearing Thursday, April 16, 2015

MR. THOMAS: In any event, will you allow, at least make a recommendation that he, the Bureau of Prisons designate him to Morgantown?

THE COURT: Morgantown, sure, yes, I will do that.

Mr. Floarea, you have the right to -- I don't think you have the right to appeal the sentence, actually, because it's within the guideline range, and you've waived that as part of your Rule 11 agreement.

To the extent there's any issue that you wish to raise on appeal, that has to be done within 14 days.

I'll let you self surrender; that is, you'll wait until we have a placement for you with the Bureau of Prisons. The marshals will inform you and inform Mr. Thomas. You may self surrender. I'm going to recommend Morgantown with maybe Milan as a backup if they can't get you to Morgantown for some reason, and then if you can't get there on your own, you're to let Mr. Thomas know and he'll arrange for transportation through the marshals.

I wish you good luck.

THE DEFENDANT: All right, Your Honor.

THE CLERK: Court stands in recess.

(Proceedings concluded 9:56 a.m.)

#### CERTIFICATION

I, Suzanne Jacques, Official Court Reporter for the United States
District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division,
hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the
proceedings in the above-entitled cause on the date set forth.

s:\\_\_\_\_\_

Suzanne Jacques, RPR, RMR, CRR, FCRR Official Court Reporter Eastern District of Michigan